



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,376	02/17/2004	Jeff Reynar	60001.0266US01/MS303913.1	1828
7590 Christopher J. Leonard Merchant & Gould P.C. P.O. Box 2903 Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER SIEDLER, DOROTHY S	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/13/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/780,376

**Applicant(s)**

REYNAR ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dorothy Sarah Siedler

**Art Unit**

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ~~6-13-05, 12-12-05, 4-26-06, 5-22-06, 7-3-06, 8-21-06, 8-28-06, 10-02-06, 10-26-06, 11-20-06, 12-21-06, 2-12-07, 2-16-07, 3-12-07, 4-30-07, 6-22-07, 7-30-07, 9-27-07, 10-19-07, 12-3-07, 12-19-07, 1-7-08, 1-31-08, 2-22-08, 3-26-08, 4-8-08, 5-15-08.~~

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

**Office Action Summary**

Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20080529

### DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the application filed February 17, 2004. Claims 1-17 are pending and are considered below.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ***Storisteanu*** (6, 976, 2090).

As per claim 1, ***Storisteanu*** discloses a method of automatically performing actions on or in association with recognized text strings, comprising:

receiving a text string from a computer-generated document (column 3 lines 35-36 and Figure 1 item 12, *text processing module*);

passing the text string to a recognizer application (column 5 lines 14-25, *the text is processed by the live parser (recognizer application) therefore it is inherent that it was passed to the recognizer application*);

recognizing the text string as belonging to a given semantic category (column 5 lines 14-25, *the live parser records classes (semantic categories) and sets activemarks*);

utilizing the object model of the host application, performing one or more actions on the recognized text string in the computer-generated document (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text)*).

**Storisteanu** does not disclose passing the recognizer application a pointer to an object model of a host application from which the text string is received. However, pointers are programming language data types commonly used to refer to the location of another item in memory. Within object-oriented programming, pointers are regularly used to traverse string structures, and pointers to functions are used for binding methods.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the known technique of using pointers in **Storisteanu**, since pointers improve performance for repetitive tasks, thus improving overall system performance.

As per claim 2, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 1, whereby receiving the text string from the computer-generated document includes receiving the text string at the host application (column 3 lines 35-36, *text processing module*), and whereby passing

Art Unit: 2626

the text string to a recognizer application includes passing the text string from the host application to the recognizer application (column 5 lines 14-25, *the text is processed by the live parser(recognizer application) therefore it is inherent that it was passed to the recognizer application*).

As per claim 3, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 1, but **Storisteanu** does not disclose prior to performing one or more actions on the recognized text string, accessing the object model of the host application by the recognizer application via the pointer to the object model. However, pointers are programming language data types commonly used to refer to the location of another item in memory. Within object-oriented programming, pointers are regularly used to traverse string structures, and pointers to functions are used for binding methods.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the known technique of using pointers in **Storisteanu**, since pointers improve performance for repetitive tasks, thus improving overall system performance.

As per claim 4, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 1, whereby performing one or more actions on the recognized text string includes parsing the computer-generated document containing the text string for contextual information associated with the text string, and utilizing the contextual information by the recognizer application to perform

Art Unit: 2626

additional recognition on the text string (column 2 lines 4-10, *a secondary parse is triggered by user changes to the file, during which the activemarks are kept synchronized*).

As per claim 5, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 1, whereby performing one or more actions on the recognized text string includes performing one or more actions on the recognized text string without user action (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text) automatically*).

As per claim 6, **Storisteanu** discloses a method of automatically performing actions on or in association with recognized text or data strings, comprising:

receiving a text string from a computer-generated document (column 3 lines 35-36 and Figure 1 item 12, *text processing module*);

passing the text string to a recognizer application (column 5 lines 14-25, *the text is processed by the live parser (recognizer application) therefore it is inherent that it was passed to the recognizer application*);

recognizing the text string as belonging to a given semantic category (column 5 lines 14-25, *the live parser records classes (semantic categories) and sets activemarks*);

passing information from the recognizer application to a host application from which the text string is received, said information identifying the text string as belonging to the given semantic category (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text) on the text in the text processing module*);

at the host application, firing an event associated with an action application programmed to perform a desired action on the text string (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text)*); and

in response to the fired event, causing the action application to perform the desired action on the recognized text string in the computer-generated document (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text)*).

As per claim 7, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 6, whereby receiving the text string from the computer-generated document includes receiving the text string from the host application and further comprising passing the text string from the host application to the recognizer application (column 5 lines 14-25, *the text is processed by the live parser (recognizer application) therefore it is inherent that it was passed to the recognizer application*).



As per claim 8, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 6, whereby passing information from the recognizer application to the host application includes passing the location of the text string in the computer-generated document from which the text string is received (column 2 lines 8-10, *during the processing of a file, the activemarks are kept synchronized with the text being edited*).

As per claim 9, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 6, whereby firing an event associated with an action application programmed to perform a desired action on the text string includes firing a document level event (column 5 lines 44-55, *the activemarks module sets up activemarks on the text within the file*).

As per claim 10, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 6, whereby firing an event associated with an action application programmed to perform a desired action on the text string includes firing an application level event (column 4 lines 53-60, *the activemarks link or bind any piece of text within the document with any editor command or macro*).

As per claim 11, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 6, but **Storisteanu** does not disclose prior to causing the action application to perform the desired action on the recognized text string in the computer-generated document, causing the action

application to trap the fired event from the host application. However, software traps, which are conditional jumps to an exception or interrupt handling routine, are commonly used in within computer operating systems.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to cause the action application to trap the fired event from the host application in **Storisteanu**, since a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the options within his or her technical grasp.

As per claim 12, **Storisteanu** discloses a method of automatically performing actions on or in association with recognized text or data strings, comprising:

receiving a text string from a host application entered into a computer-generated document (column 3 lines 35-36 and Figure 1 item 12, *text processing module*);

passing the text string to a recognizer application (column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text) on the text in the text processing module*);

recognizing the text string as belonging to a given semantic category (column 5 lines 14-25, *the live parser records classes (semantic categories) and sets activemarks*);

passing information from the recognizer application to the host application, said information identifying the text string as belonging to the given semantic category

(column 5 lines 44-55, *the live parser records classes and sets activemarks (performs an action on the recognized text) on the text in the text processing module*).

**Storisteanu** does not disclose at the recognizer application, setting a property value identifying a desired action to be performed on the text string, at the host application, calling an action application identified by the property value and programmed to performed the desired action on the text string, and causing the action application to perform the desired action on the text string. However in software architecture, property values, generally encode as arrays, are commonly used to define a function or characteristic of an object that manifests through that objects behavior.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to set a property value identifying a desired action to be performed on the text string, at the host application, call an action application identified by the property value and programmed to performed the desired action on the text string, and cause the action application to perform the desired action on the text string in **Storisteanu** since a person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the options within his or her technical grasp.

As per claim 13, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 12, whereby receiving the text string from the computer-generated document includes receiving the text string at the host application (column 3 lines 35-36 and Figure 1 item 12, *text processing module*), and whereby passing the text string to the recognizer application includes

Art Unit: 2626

passing the text string from the host application to the recognizer application (column 5 lines 14-25, *the text is processed by the live parser(recognizer application) therefore it is inherent that it was passed to the recognizer application*).

As per claim 14, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 12, whereby passing information from the recognizer application to the host application includes passing the location of the text string in the computer-generated document from which the text string is received (column 2 lines 8-10, *during the processing of a file, the activemarks are kept synchronized with the text being edited*).

As per claims 15 16 and 17, **Storisteanu** discloses the method of claim 12, but **Storisteanu** does not disclose whereby setting a property value identifying the desired action to be performed on the text string includes: at the recognizer application, depositing the property value into a property value data structure, passing the host application a pointer to the property value in the property value data structure, at the host application, receiving the pointer to the property value, at the host application, utilizing the pointer to the property value to identify the desired action to be performed on the text string in the computer-generated document and after the desired action is performed on the text string in the computer-generated document, deleting the property value from the property value data structure. However, pointers and property values are common programming language data types; Pointers are commonly used to refer to the

location of another item in memory, and, when used in object-oriented programming, are regularly used to traverse string structures. Property values, generally encode as arrays, are commonly used to define a function or characteristic of an object that manifests through that objects behavior.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to at the recognizer application, deposit the property value into a property value data structure, pass the host application a pointer to the property value in the property value data structure, at the host application, receive the pointer to the property value, at the host application, utilize the pointer to the property value to identify the desired action to be performed on the text string in the computer-generated document and after the desired action is performed on the text string in the computer-generated document, delete the property value from the property value data structure in ***Storisteanu***, since one of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the options within his or her technical grasp, in order to achieve the predictable result of quickly and efficiently instructing the host application of the action to perform, while minimizing memory usage.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see the PTO-892 form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dorothy Sarah Siedler whose telephone number is 571-270-1067. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DSS

/Richemond Dorvil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

